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THE PRESENCE OF EMOTIONS IN HUMAN LIFE and behavior is undeniable. The task of the philosopher is to understand them and, more particularly, to focus on the conflict with reason that they seem to cause within human nature. However, insofar as philosophy defines itself as an attempt at rational reflection, what is ultimately at stake is the way in which philosophy understands itself. When we limit ourselves to the way in which emotions are present in human nature, different options present themselves. In a dualistic model emotions can be said to belong to the realm of the body. They must therefore necessarily be dominated by reason. Body is opposed to mind, and emotions to the rational. Another approach consists in bringing the emotions within the soul. This leads to the idea of an internal division of the soul into a rational and irrational part, a so-called divided reason. Reason has to learn how to use the irrational in itself in an appropriate way. The main problem with this theory is that it remains dualistic. The internalization of the passions has not solved anything. A third possibility presents itself whenever some kind of unity of body and soul is recognized. The passions or emotions do not any more belong to the body alone or to the irrational in the soul alone. They are to be located in the interplay between the bodily and the mental. In this case reason can no longer be put over and against the passions. On the contrary, reason has an original relationship to the emotions. The emotions in their turn are not rational in the strict sense of the word, but they are certainly not strangers to rationality. In this case "reason" is understood in another, broader sense, because what is happening here is more than the internalization of the conflict between the emotions and reason, described above, which leads to an irrational and rational part of the soul. It ultimately means a redefinition of the concept of reason itself and a neutralization of the concept of the "irrational."

Thomas Aquinas wrote for the first time in the history of philosophy a systematic treatise on the human passions that considered them from an anthropological as well as from a moral point of view. His theory of the passions belongs to this third or what we could call "Aristotelian" approach. The aim of this article is to bring out the richness of Aquinas's insights by analyzing his theory within the broader framework of his anthropology.

A brief look at the existing secondary literature on the passions according to Thomas Aquinas shows us that the older literature on this topic is historically oriented. It looks for the philosophical sources of Thomas's theory in ancient philosophy. The insights of Thomas are consequently only paraphrased, and briefly so. More recent studies take a different approach. Some of them deal with the passions in general. Others either focus on one particular passion or one specific aspect of the passions or try to formulate the impact of Thomas's insights on his ethics in general. Besides these studies are also to be mentioned books that discuss the passions within the broader framework of another larger topic.
These studies do not and cannot always do justice to the richness of Thomas's treatise on the passions. (1)

The relatively meager interest in this topic of medieval philosophy is in a way surprising given the fact that it is a major topic of research in ancient philosophy. We can refer here to the works of Julia Annas and Martha Nussbaum. (2) Recent studies about so-called emotional intelligence should also be noted here. These studies, however, are not founded upon any historical knowledge. Consequently, the classical philosophical questions about the relation between reason and emotion, or about the place that the emotions may hold in a moral theory, are omitted. (3)

The purpose of this article is to relate the passions to Thomas's anthropological presuppositions. More precisely, I intend to show that his theory of the passions is based upon three fundamental insights of his anthropology that are related among themselves as three concentric circles. First, the passions are based upon Thomas's hylomorphic conception of man. Second, Thomas's hylomorphism reflects his insight that man has a unique position in God's creation as a "confinium," a frontier being, because he combines in himself the spiritual and the material-corporeal world. His theory of the passions of the soul is one of the expressions of the idea that man is a "medium," a horizon. Third, although man is a confine between the spiritual and the material world, the fulfillment of his nature (telos) is ultimately to be found in the spiritual world. Perfect happiness is reached when the immortal soul reaches the visio Dei. In this life, however, imperfect happiness needs to be realized in and through man's relation to the material world, that is, his body and the external world. The passions as sensitive reactions to the external world are therefore an integral part of the basic, teleological directedness of human beings toward their proper fulfillment. As the passions are not external, not strangers to man's specific appetite, they are necessarily present when his telos is actually realized in and through man's moral activity. The discussion of the passions can therefore not be about the way in which reason can guarantee its freedom over and against the passions. It must rather be concerned with the way in which the passions form a necessary dimension of rational human nature and its fulfillment. One should not forget that Thomas considers the passions of the soul to be one of the three principles of human activity (besides will and reason). (4)

In order to explain this role and function of the passions, I have divided this article into three major parts. In the first part I shall consider in detail Thomas's definition of "passion." The aim is to arrive at a correct understanding of the passions as well as a deepened insight into the implications of Thomas's definition. This will allow us to show that the passions can be understood only within a hylomorphic conception of human nature. In the second part, I shall analyze the relationship between passions and reason. The central insight that we want to develop here is that the passions reflect the fact that man is a "frontier being," combining in himself the spiritual and the material world. Although I shall not directly discuss the moral aspect of the passions, the ultimate basis for the contribution of the passions to the moral act will be made clear. In the third part, I shall give a more detailed account of the relationship between reason and passions in both its positive and negative aspects. What is stressed in this final section is that the passions as sensitive appetites can be an integral part of the human striving for self-fulfillment, that is, fulfillment of the telos of the human person, but that it is ultimately reason that bears the responsibility for giving them the place they deserve.

What this article will not provide is an account of the historical sources of Thomas's concept of the passions or a detailed analysis of the individual passions as Thomas describes them in the Summa Theologiae. It will also not discuss the difference between the so-called irascible and concupiscible passions. As I have mentioned above, it does not treat in detail the impact of Thomas's theory of the passions on his ethics.
Methodologically, this study is the result of extensive reading of primary sources. Given the limits of space, this is only partly reflected in the footnotes. Thus my quotations and references are mainly from the text of the Summa Theologiae.

I

Thomas’s Definition of the Passions. The following analysis consists of a number of subsections, each of which concerns one aspect of Thomas’s definition of the passions. In the first subsection I consider the place of the treatise on the passions within the moral theory of Thomas. In the second, I focus on the definition of the passions. In the third subsection, I analyze the relationship between the passions and the body. In the fourth, I examine the passions as movements of the soul. Finally, in the fifth subsection, I clarify the type of knowledge that is at the basis of the passions.

The Place of Thomas Aquinas’s Treatise on the Passions within His Moral Theory. Thomas’s treatise on the passions occupies an exceptional place within the history of philosophical anthropology. Thomas was indeed the first to give a systematically organized, coherent, and extensive account of the passions of the soul from a psychological as well as from a moral point of view.

Ancient philosophy principally treated the moral aspect of the passions, and less so, their psychological-anthropological aspect (for example, Plato, Aristotle, and especially the Stoics and Epicurus). In the Middle Ages the passions were discussed within the framework of moral theology. Albertus Magnus wrote about this topic, but his insights were not organized into a treatise comparable in scope and insight to that of his pupil Thomas. (5)

Thomas treats the passions only briefly in the first part of the Summa Theologiae, in the so-called treatise on man (q. 81). It is in the first part of the second part of the Summa Theologiae (prima secundae) that Thomas discusses them at length. He first gives a general account that includes their definition and an explicit reflection upon their moral quality. Then follows a detailed and long discussion of the individual passions, which is outstanding for the psychological richness of its insights. (6)

It is important to situate this treatise on the passions within the broader framework of the entire prima secundae of the Summa, which is devoted to an analysis of the principles of the human moral act. The treatise is preceded by the well-known treatise concerning the ultimate goal of man, namely, happiness (qq. 1-5), with which Thomas opens this part of the Summa. He follows this with a study of the will (qq. 6-17) and a discussion of the moral qualification of the human act (qq. 18-21). Only then do we find the treatise on the passions, which covers about one fourth of the entire prima secundae of the Summa. This is followed immediately by an analysis of habit (habitus) and of the virtues (qq. 49-68), which shows that the virtues, or at least some of them, relate to the passions. Finally, the passions are discussed one last time within the framework of sin and its causes, "de causa peccati ex parte appetitus sensitivi" (q. 77).

The number of questions devoted to a topic does not always reflect the importance it has for Thomas. In this case, however, the fact that Thomas at this point in his discussion devotes a treatise of such considerable length to the passions of the soul bears witness beyond doubt to the importance he attaches to the passions within his moral theory. Thomas is ultimately interested in the passions from a moral point of view. A human moral act is only complete if it includes the emotional dimension that is an integral part of human nature. The passions are morally neutral and are not a priori negative disturbances in the human soul. This much being said, one should, however, be aware that Thomas really works out here a complete anthropology of the passions. His insight into the contribution of the
emotions to the moral act is based upon the anthropological conviction that the emotions are an integral dimension of the human being.

The Definition of the Passions. Thomas's concept of "passion" clearly differs from ours. We understand passion to be a strong emotion, mainly of anger or love. In the latter case, passion is related almost exclusively to the body and even more to the sexual and erotic, although it can also be related to enthusiasm. Passion belongs to a semantic field in which an opposition exists between rationality, reflection, morality, calm, control, and convention, on the one hand, and irrationality, absence of reflection, immorality, disturbance, the unexpected, the devouring fire, and even the extramarital, on the other.

According to the everyday use of the term, "passion" has two meanings, an active and a passive one. When its source is considered, "passion" refers to an active, overwhelming power. As such, passion is a force that needs to be tempered or suppressed in one way or another. But "passion" also has a passive connotation insofar as it is something that one undergoes, that one suffers, without really knowing and controlling its source.

These two aspects of the English word "passion" are to be found also in Thomas's passio. The Latin word has, however, a much broader meaning. Therefore there is a difficulty in translating passio by the English "passion." "Emotion" and "affect" might be suggested here as translations of "passion," but they also do not cover the richness of the word passio. I have decided, therefore, to stick to the word "passion," but I must ask the reader to leave the modern meaning of the word behind and to give careful attention to the meaning it has in Thomas Aquinas's thought.

Thomas distinguishes different meanings of the word passio or the verb pati. Sometimes he differentiates two meanings, and at other times he gives us three. (7) For the sake of clarity, three meanings should be distinguished. Only two of them will be relevant for an understanding of the "passions of the soul."

The most common (communiter dicta) meaning of passio, which Thomas sometimes says to be an improper one (impropie), is "to receive" (recipere). This meaning is related to the Greek patein. The act of receiving something always involves two parties, namely, an active agent (agens) and a receiving patient (patientes). The patient receives the agent and as a result of that is activated by the agent and even brought to perfection or fulfillment. (8) "Passion" in this sense is a movement (motus), a process in which a transition is made from potency to act. It is important that it is not the activity of the agent that constitutes "passion" but the receiving activity of the patient. (9) This meaning of "passion" is used by Thomas in order to understand and to explain the apprehensive act of the senses and the intellect: sense perception and understanding are essentially a passive reception of the known object. Thomas expands this passive quality, however, far beyond the human being: everything in this physical universe can pati. More precisely, in Thomas's universe, created reality, insofar as it is created, always possesses a certain degree of potentiality. And this potentiality is precisely the basis of its receptivity. (10) This first meaning of the word "passion" is not relevant for Thomas's discussion of the passions of the soul.

The second meaning of "passion" narrows the first, general meaning. "Passion" is now said to be the act of receiving a form, and more precisely an accidental form, whereby the reception of this form goes hand in hand with the letting go or loss (abjectio) of another form already possessed by the patient. (11) Essential to this second meaning is that the interplay between reception and loss constitutes a change in the being involved. Thomas describes this change as an alteration (alteratio) or qualitative transmutation. (12)
The following examples may clarify the above. (13) "Becoming sick" or "becoming healthy" are considered by Thomas as "passions" in this second sense. When man becomes sick, he loses his health and receives illness. Health and illness are contrary to each other. When a sick person becomes healthy again, the illness is lost and health is received instead. Another instance is that of becoming sad or happy.

This second meaning of passion is based upon two presuppositions. First, the received form is external with regard to the subject of the passion. (14) Second, the received form is contrary to the lost form. (15) Otherwise the process of concomitant reception and loss is meaningless. The so-called contrarieties between these two forms is an essential characteristic of this meaning of passion. What is not essential at this point is whether the passion has a positive or negative effect on the patient.

"Passion" in this second sense has to do with potentiality, the ability to receive, but not with mere reception. Reception of a new form goes hand in hand with the letting go of another, contrary one. This kind of movement can therefore only be found in material or corporeal substances because they can undergo accidental, qualitative changes (as distinct from substantial changes). (16) How this second meaning of the word passio is basic for Thomas's understanding of the "passions of the soul" will be explained in the next subsection.

The third and most proper meaning of "passion" or passio proprie dicta is again based on the relationship between an agent and a patient and on the combination of receiving and letting go. Once again, the impact on the subject does not affect its substantial form for there is no change in the substantial identity of the subject. The difference between the second and the third meaning consists in this: that the change is said to have only a negative effect. (17) According to the descriptions and examples of Thomas, the harm can be done on two levels: on the level of the natural disposition of something and on the level of its natural movement. (18) Concerning the natural disposition of something, Thomas says that the reception of an external, contrary form can affect the natural quality or disposition of a being. For example, when water is warmed up, it loses its natural quality of "coldness"; to become sick goes against man's natural disposition to be healthy; to be sad goes against man's natural disposition to be happy. Other examples of Thomas are pain, despair, and fear. (19) But a passion not only harms the natural disposition of a being. Even more than that: a passion may prevent the natural movement of a being from reaching its specific fulfillment or goal. (20) For example, when a stone is prevented from falling down, its natural movement remains unfulfilled. The same happens when man is prevented from exercising the activity of his will. Sadness can also be mentioned here again: the centripetal movement of the heart and the body that accompanies this passion is completely opposed to man's vital movement, which consists in a centrifugal movement of the heart and the parts of the body. Therefore sadness can sometimes even be fatal. (21)

This third meaning of "passion" has little or nothing to do with the first, where "passion" means reception. On the contrary, in its most proper meaning, this third sense of "passion" entails suffering. Passion can imply that the natural disposition of an individual substance is harmed, but even more than that: it can cause an individual substance to be impeded from fulfilling its natural inclination and reaching its natural end. It is clear from this that the concept of "passion" presupposes the metaphysical idea of teleological nature. The importance of this point shall become clear in the third part of this paper.

The three meanings of passio or pati discussed above are applicable not only to the human being but also to the creation as a whole (first meaning), or to the material beings in particular (second and third meaning). When Thomas discusses the passions of the human soul, he uses the second and third meanings of the word. How he can do so and what this implies for his understanding of human
passion will become clear in the following sections.

Passions and the Body. In the preceding I have touched upon but not developed a basic insight of Thomas regarding the passions. Passions in the proper sense of the word (second and third meanings) presuppose matter or, more specifically, corporeality. Only that which has a material or bodily dimension can be subject to passion (22) because matter and body are characterized by their possibility of receiving or losing a form. Thus passion as a qualitative change is only possible in that which is material.

What does this mean for a being composed of matter and form, of body and soul, as is the human being? Thomas writes that in this case the passions are "accidental" to the form, that is, to the human soul. (23) This statement needs to be understood correctly within the framework of the most basic presupposition of Thomas's anthropology, namely, his hylomorphic conception of man. A human being is a substantial unity of body and soul. Given this, it is clear that Thomas will say that the human passions can not be found in the soul per se or in the body alone. The passions are per se predicated of the human being as a hylomorphic unity. They are consequently only per accidens predicated of the soul alone. Strictly speaking, for Thomas, passions that belong only to the intellectual-spiritual level are not real passions. Passions that belong only to the bodily realm are not real human passions either. What is at stake here is the question, "What is the subject of the passions?" As Thomas says: it is the compositum that undergoes a passion: compositum patitur. (24)

The fact that passions belong to the compositum of body and soul implies that in every passion a material side (a bodily change) and a spiritual side (a movement of the soul) can be distinguished. Body and soul are not related as cause and effect--as they were for Descartes. Rather, they are the material and formal aspects of one and the same event/movement. (25) They are even adapted to each other and proportioned in their respective movements. (26) Let us give a more detailed analysis of this.

According to Thomas the material-bodily aspect of every passion is a transmutatio corporalis. (27) By this he means the expansion or shrinking of the heart. The heart is, however, the principle of the movements of the external organs of the body. Therefore every passion is not only accompanied by a movement of the heart but also by movements of the limbs. (28) Thomas describes, for example, how the body reacts when an individual feels anger (ira), fear (timor), pain, and sorrow. (29) Insofar as his insights are based upon an outdated physiology, they are not entirely relevant to us. What is important, however, is that he understands that the affective or emotional life of man involves his whole being, his complete vital movement. It must also be mentioned here that Thomas does not distinguish the individual passions according to the physiological changes they provoke.

The formal dimension of a passion is more important for us here than the bodily one. It has essentially the same structure as the corporeal, qualitative change. While receiving a form, the soul is "being moved." It is a passive movement (motus) in the sense that it is a movement that is caused by a form as an external agent. (30) Passions of the soul are in the first place reactions. The act of receiving a form, however, goes hand in hand with the "letting go" of another form and with the pursuit of the first one. The agent that elicits this pursuit has such an influence on the patient that he is pulled out of himself (trahi), (31) attracted as it were by that agent. Passion results in the victory of the agent over the patient, which Thomas also characterizes as some kind of assimilation. (32) All this explains why the passion of the soul is moved (motus) and movement (movens). It is a motus movens, a reaction-action. (33) This implies that a passion of the soul is not a "natural" movement, in the sense that it finds its origin in an internal bodily need, as do the movements of the vegetative soul. Rather, it is a reaction to an external agent or stimulus. Passions of the soul are basically reactions of the unity of
body and soul to the external world.

In summary, what has been said above enables us to formulate a general description of the passions of the soul. First, passion is always a "moved movement"; it is a reaction-action. Passion is evoked by an attractive object and results in a modification in the subject. Thus passions are reactions to the external world. Second, Thomas's theory of the passions finds its first and most basic presupposition in his hylomorphic view of man. Therefore, the passions are psychosomatic changes. They consist of simultaneous changes in body and soul. More now needs to be said regarding the nature of these changes or movements.

The Passions as Movements of the Soul. The first question to be asked concerns the location of the passions of the soul. Thomas points out that the passions of the soul are not to be found in the vegetative soul. This dimension of the soul has an autonomous movement toward an object and is never excited by an object. The vegetative soul is the complex of powers of the soul that explains the activities through which the human being as corporeal being cares for its survival as an individual being or as belonging to a certain kind. Its movements are not reactions to external reality. The passions have to be located, therefore, either in the sensitive or in the rational soul. Both possess a cognitive power and an appetitive power.

According to Thomas the passions as "moved movement" are not to be found in the cognitive powers of the soul. What characterizes the cognitive, apprehending powers is the fact that they assimilate the known object. Knowledge is the assimilation of the known in the knowing subject. (34) One can also put it this way: the goal of knowledge is taking the known object into the soul secundum modum animae. In contradistinction to this, the appetitive powers draw the soul out of itself toward an object. (35) This fits the description of a passion given above (trahi ad id quod est agentis).

These distinctions imply some interesting insights of Thomas. First, passion itself is not knowledge. The passions do not instruct us about the object that arouses the passion. Second, this does not exclude the fact that a passion is always the result of knowledge. Striving toward an object necessarily presupposes the guidance of knowledge because the object that is striven after is necessarily a known object (compare below). Third, "passion" as a psychosomatic change differs essentially from the intellectual activity of a human being. Passion is a reaction to the external world; it shows how man stands in this world. To be a human being means not only to have intellectual knowledge of the world; it means also to react to the world in that all-encompassing reaction of body and soul which is a passion. Fourth, this implies also that knowledge itself has no direct impact upon the world. It needs the help of the appetitive powers in order to reach the world.

We still have not determined whether the passions are to be found in the sensitive appetitive power or in the rational appetitive power, but the answer is obvious from what precedes. Because the passions belong necessarily to the compositum of body and soul, only in that power of the soul which stands in an original relationship to the body can the passions be located. This immediately excludes the rational appetite. In Thomas's view, only the sensitive appetite is related to the body, or, more specifically, to the heart and so to the whole body. (36) The passions belong to the sensitive appetite, which stands at the crossroad, as it were, between body and soul.

We can summarize this section in this way. The passions of the soul are to be found neither in the vegetative soul nor in the rational cognitive or appetitive power but exclusively in the sensitive appetitive power of the soul. A passion is a reaction-action on the level of the sensitive soul and is necessarily accompanied by a physical change. The passion itself is not a cognitive act, but it needs to be aroused by some kind of knowledge, as does every appetitive act.
Knowledge at the Basis of the Passions. One of the basic presuppositions of Thomas's thinking about reality is that it is characterized by a universal teleology. This teleology in its turn presupposes God's intellect, which gives each particular reality its proper end and also organizes the means toward that end. This relationship between the teleology of this world and the intellectual knowledge of God is only one application of Thomas's broader insight of the relationship between appetite and knowledge: appetite necessarily presupposes knowledge. Nothing can be striven after that is not known in one way or another. Thomas uses this insight also to explain the sensitive appetite: just like any other appetite, it presupposes knowledge. Its object has to be a "known" object. (37)

This knowledge can either have an external or an internal source. The external sources for sensitive knowledge are the five external senses. For the internal sources of knowledge, Thomas points to one of the internal senses, namely, the "imagination," and also to reason. Knowledge based on the external senses is much more limited in its scope than knowledge based on the inner source of knowledge. (38) This becomes clear if we consider the imagination.

"Imagination" has two meanings in the writings of Thomas. On the one hand, it is the stock of information built up by sensible contents as they have been provided by the five external senses. Imagination in human beings also involves what is called fantasy, that is, the possibility that human beings have of combining already available sensible contents. (39) Imagination in this twofold sense can offer sensible, cognitive contents, which in turn can arouse the appetitive movement of the sensible soul or the passions.

What is interesting is that Thomas accepts not only direct and indirect sensible knowledge as a basis for the passions but also intellectual knowledge. Because intellectual knowledge is more general and abstract, it needs the help of the imagination in order to convert the abstract thoughts into concrete images. (40) Thomas gives us the example of the believing intellect. It accepts the existence of punishment for sins in the afterlife in a cognitive way, but it is through the help of the imagination that it pictures a burning fire (ignis urens) and a biting worm (vermis rodens) with the result that man is overcome by fear. (41)

To complete this account, we need to add the following points. While it is true that knowledge of an object is a necessary condition (conditio sine qua non) for the arousal of a movement of the sensitive soul, it is, however, not a sufficient condition. Knowledge itself does not cause us to have passions. Passion requires that the object known be presented as attractive or as repugnant (ratio appetibilitatis). The known object must be grasped as attractive, as worth striving after, or as repellant and worth fleeing from. In other words, the knowledge of the object must be accompanied by a value-judgment. (42) The power that judges the attractiveness of a known object at the sensitive level is called the estimative power (vis aestimativa) in the animal and the cogitative power (vis cogitativa) in man. The vis aestimativa in the animal is an internal sense, inseparably connected to the external senses. It is a "utilitarian" sense because it ultimately serves the existence and survival of the animal. (43) For example, when the lamb sees a wolf, it flees. It does so not because it perceives the beautiful color of the skin of the wolf, but because it instinctively recognizes the wolf as its natural enemy. The lamb "understands" what is not visible, that is, the wolf's threat to its life. Characteristic of the animal is that its estimative power is an instinctive power. The animal possesses instinctive patterns of judgment and consequently of reaction-action. (44)

In man, this same power is called the vis cogitativa. It is a sensitive power, but one directly connected to universal reason. Thomas calls this power also the ratio inferioris, the ratio particularis, or the intellectus passivus. It evaluates the attractiveness of an object in a typically rational, discursive manner ("inquirendo et conferendo"), although the contents of its thoughts are particular ("collativa
intentionum particularum"). What is important, however, is that it has a direct relationship to universal reason and as such judges an object against a comprehensive or overall background. (45)

Let us summarize what has been said above. By the "passions of the soul" Thomas Aquinas understands all the movements of the appetite power of the sensitive soul (46) including those with negative effects. These appetite movements are not an expression in the soul of the needs of the body, as are the movements of the vegetative soul. They are modifications on the level of the sensitive soul, resulting from the knowledge of an external object. This knowledge is a combination of a sensation or sense-experience of some kind and a judgment on the sensitive level. The object that arouses the passions is never a mere material object. It is a "known" object that is evaluated for its attractiveness or repulsiveness. In man this evaluation is subject to reason. The passions of the soul always presuppose the close relationship between body and soul and are therefore, always and necessarily, accompanied by bodily changes. Thomas's theory of the passions of the soul presupposes and reflects hylomorphism as a theory about the relation between body and soul. His hylomorphism belongs, however, to the more fundamental anthropological insight that man is a "frontier" between the material and the spiritual world. I shall develop this last idea in the second part of this article.

II

The Relationship between Passion and Reason. We understand Thomas's theory of the passions of the soul to rest upon three major presuppositions, the first and most central of which is his hylomorphic view of man, as we showed in section 1 of this paper. This view in turn includes and contains two basic insights, namely, that man has only one soul with three dimensions or functions (vegetative, sensitive, and rational) and that a "political" relation, so to speak, exists between the sensitive and the rational dimensions of the human soul. It is precisely this latter and second insight that makes clear that the hylomorphic view of man can be fully understood only if seen in relation to a second major presupposition of Thomas, namely, that man is a "frontier" being. Let me focus on this in the second part of my paper.

I will begin by examining a basic distinction that Thomas makes concerning the passions. He states repeatedly that the passions of man can be looked at in two ways. First, insofar as they are common to man and animal; second, insofar as they are naturally directed toward reason. (47) In the first case, it seems that abstraction is made of the rationality that characterizes the human being. Passion as common to man and animal would be a natural, instinctive pattern of response to the external world. My interpretation is that Thomas does not merely intend to stress the fact that passions are common to men and animals. Rather, he aims to bring forward the impulsive, unmediated aspect of the passions, which they can show in the absence of reason (compare below). Second, these same passions can be understood as being attuned in a natural way to reason and to its command and control. It is only in this second case that justice is done to the specific human character of the passions.

Let me develop this second point in more detail. That the passions have this kind of relationship to reason is based upon Thomas's insights into the nature of reason itself. According to Thomas, "rational" refers not only to that which is rational per se, in itself, or essentially, as is man's intellect (intellectus), reason (ratio), and will (voluntas). "Rational" is also that which participates in reason. (48) Man distinguishes himself from the animals not only by that which is essentially reasonable but also by that which participates in rationality. (49) Such is the case with the sensitive soul. In contrast to the vegetative soul, which is by definition nonrational, the sensitive soul by definition participates in rationality.

What does this participation entail for the passions and for reason? According to Thomas, the sensitive
soul can obey reason (potest obedientire rationi) and is meant to obey reason (nata est obedientire rationi, subjectus rationis, sequit rationem). (50) By its very nature the sensitive soul is directed toward reason and open to its influence. Even more, the participation of the sensitive soul in reason means that the sensitive soul is capable of and "willing" to be controlled by reason and to obey the orders of reason. From the point of view of reason, this participation means that reason's field of activity is extended beyond the strictly rational. If this original, mutual relationship between reason and the passions of the soul did not exist, the influence of reason on the passions would be an act of violence, and further, the passions would never be able to constitute a positive contribution to the human act.

Thomas describes in detail the points of contact between the passions and reason (which also includes the will). They are found at both the level of sensitive knowledge and the level of sensitive appetite. With respect to sense-knowledge, Thomas holds that imagination (in the sense of fantasy) and the sensitive power of judgment (vis cogitativa) have an immediate contact with universal reason, as I have mentioned above. The sensitive appetite, in turn, is directly related to the will or rational appetite. The actual execution of the sensitive appetite through the moving power (vis motiva) ultimately needs the approval of the will. (51)

The meaning of this original relationship between reason and passions now becomes clear. First, it indicates that man does not have to be subject to his passions as such. The immediacy of his reaction to external stimuli can be broken. Human beings can wait in order to react to the world. They can respond at a future point of time and in a different place. Passions are most certainly not instincts.

Second, if we know that Thomas accepts that man as a rational being has a natural striving toward his specific end or telos, then the original relationship between reason/will and passion means that the sensitive appetite is an essential dimension of man's natural appetite. The passions, therefore, should be understood as intrinsic to the teleology of man, to his original appetite for the fulfillment, realization, and completion of his human nature. This point will be developed in section 3.

The passions, however, are not to be characterized only by their being attuned to reason and will. Human beings experience them as an independent force and as having an enormous power. We all know how we are sometimes overwhelmed by strong feelings. (52) Thomas gives several reasons for this. First, passions are a reaction to an external world of changing objects, and precisely because of that they have an unpredictable and uncontrollable nature. Moreover, we have to take into account the fact that the passions have a relationship to the body. That relationship prevents their being completely attuned to reason. What is meant here by "body" is the bodily disposition (qualitas, dispositio corporis) that is proper to any particular man and not the bodily change that naturally accompanies a passion. (53) Man's bodily disposition can explain the presence of certain passions. For example, someone might be prone to the passion of anger on the basis of his bodily disposition. Ultimately, however, it is original sin that stands as the origin of this rebellious dimension of the passions. Original sin broke the harmony between passions and reason.

It is apparently this rebellious aspect of the passions of the soul that Thomas wants to bring to the fore when he considers the passions as something common to man and animal. His aim, in other words, is not to show that we have passions as do the animals, but rather that the passions have a dimension of something uncontrollable, not subjected to reason, insofar as they depend upon the external, unpredictable world and upon the body. This overwhelming power of the passions is precisely experienced by man whenever the right relation between passions and reason is absent.

It is the interplay between the openness of the sensitive soul toward reason, on the one hand, and the independence of the passions, on the other, that Thomas has in mind when he calls the relationship
between the passions and the rational soul a "political" relationship. He distinguishes—as did Aristotle—this political relationship from a despotic one. (54) Characteristic of this relationship is a recognition by the ruling party of the independence and the right of self-determination of the ruled party and therefore also the right to contradict. At the same time, the ruler remains ruler and will try to convince his subjects that it is worthwhile to live according to his prescriptions or commands. When Thomas says that the passions are reasonable per participationem, or that there exists a "political" relationship between reason and the passions, he means one and the same thing. The passions are by nature subject to reason, be it only partially.

The implications of this "political relationship" between reason and the passions are enormous and need to be examined in detail. They concern not only Thomas's anthropological but also the very foundations of his moral theory. I will point out five of these implications.

(1) The passions of the soul are never to be considered as mere instincts in man. They do not belong to an "irrational soul" that stands over and against a rational soul. Rather, what defines the passions is that they contain in themselves the tension between the rational and the nonrational. Passions have a dimension that can be labeled as "nonrational" or "uncontrollable." This dimension has only to do with the origin of the passion, that is, with the object that arouses the passion and with the kind of response that, the passion is. The object as it is presented to the sensitive appetite either by the senses or by the imagination (in the first sense as a stock of information) is beyond the influence of man's reason. The same can be said about the specific kind of sensitive response that is psychosomatic in nature. On the other hand, passion is "controllable" insofar as this spontaneous movement participates in and is open to reason, through the influence of reason on the imagination (here as fantasy) and especially on the cogitative power. The influence of the will on the executive power can also be added to that. (55)

(2) The fact that Thomas locates the tension between rational and nonrational within the passions themselves does not mean that the problem of the passions is an internal problem of the soul. Ultimately what can be called the most basic tension in the human being is concentrated in the passions: namely, the tension between the body and the external, material world, on the one hand, and the soul or the spiritual, on the other hand. The passions are not only an expression of Thomas's hylomorphism. They reflect his anthropological conception of man as a frontier being, an intellectual being standing in a material reality, a being standing on the horizon of the spiritual and the material world. (56)

(3) A political ruler considers it to be one of his primordial and essential tasks not only to relate to his own needs and activities but also to act with responsibility toward his autonomous subjects. In the same way does man's reason necessarily relate not only to its own activities and goals but to those on the sensitive level as well. The relationship to the passions is an essential component of the rationality of the human being. However, this does not change the fact that reason is the ruler in this relationship.

(4) The influence of reason upon the passions must be seen as an attempt to heighten the reasonable aspect of the passions and to lessen their unpredictable and uncontrollable character. This can only be done by changing passion from a mere reaction-action into a reaction-action that fits in with the overall goals of human nature. What this means is that the object that causes the passions, and that belongs either to the external world or to one's own body, escapes every attempt of reason to control it. The same applies to the specific kind of movement that the passion is. Here reason can have no influence because passions are a specific kind of reaction of the sensitive appetite. Reason can only influence passions by influencing the evaluation that accompanies the knowledge that arouses the passions. By subordinating their goal to a more universal or a more overall human goal, reason breaks

the immediacy of their reaction with respect to time and place.

(5) The political relation between reason and the passions means that the passions do not need to affect the freedom, the responsibility for the human act. A human being remains responsible for his acts even when he acts under the influence of a passion. Only in very rare cases where the passions remove man's rationality and free will does acting out of passion annihilate completely the individual's responsibility for the act. (57)

The implications of this for Thomas's moral theory are obvious. First, insofar as the passions have a political relation to reason "by nature," they are by definition neither a disturbing factor (perturbationes animae) nor morally bad. They are not by nature directed against reason even though they possess an aspect of independence and can escape the control of reason. Accordingly, moral life does not mean a suppression of the passions but rather their integration within the original human striving for fulfillment. The peculiar character of the passions as a reaction to the external world is never eliminated, just as in a proper political relationship the peculiar character of the ruled subject is never denied. The ruler, on the contrary, can only try to accommodate the nature and character of the subjects within his own goals and aims. Hegel's technical term aufheben, which means to eliminate (on a lower level) so as to preserve by lifting up to a higher level, is apropos here.

III

Positive and Negative Aspects of the Relationship between Reason and the Passions. The purpose of this third part of my article is to point out that according to Thomas the passions can and should form an integral part of the human, rational striving for self-fulfillment in this life. I will show this by considering consecutively the positive and negative aspects of the relationship between reason and the passions. I will start with the positive influence of reason on the passions. The original "political" relationship between them means first that reason is given a controlling and governing role with regard to the passions of the soul. Such a role presupposes not only that the passions can be controlled but also that they need to be controlled. These two dimensions have to be analyzed further.

As said above, that reason can control the passions presupposes the openness of the passions toward reason. From the perspective of reason, this implies that the relation to the sensitive appetite is an essential aspect of reason. Consequently, its act of control is never an act of violence.

That reason needs to check the passions rests on the idea that the passions do not automatically contribute to the human act insofar as they lack an internal mechanism of control and can, therefore, become a destructive force. (58) They do need the guidance of reason to guarantee their contribution to the moral act of man. The immediacy of the emotional reaction both in time and space might certainly hinder man from reaching his overall rational goal. (59) We can here refer to the first part of this article, where we pointed out that the passions (in the third sense) can hinder a being from exercising its natural movement toward its goal.

It is very important, however, to understand what Thomas means by this "control" of reason. We must stress that Thomas speaks always of the "mitigation" of the passions and never of their total exclusion. When he does use the verb "to suppress" in relation to the passions, he refers only to the lack of rational order that must be repelled, not to the passions as such. One must keep in mind that the passions are not by nature perturbationes animae. (60)

The role of reason consists in the "rationalization" of the passions. This means the development of their original capacity for responding to the command of reason. Only these "rationalized" passions
are natural for man as man, that is, as a rational being. Those passions that transcend the limits of reason are contra naturam for man. (61)

Man reaches a higher degree of completeness or fulfillment if he organizes everything that is per se and per participationem rational according to his reason as root source (radix). (62) In other words, Thomas does not promote the rational knowledge of our passions as an ideal. He rather promotes the rationalization of the human affections, in the sense of achieving an internal permutation and not an external form of control. Thomas wants man to achieve a state in which he gives the right emotional responses to the surrounding world. Thus, the discussion of the passions can only be completed by a discussion of the virtues. It is with the help of the virtues that the passions can contribute constantly to the attainment of the ultimate goal of man.

With respect to the ways in which reason has to control or to direct the passions, Thomas distinguishes two possibilities. (63) First, whenever a passion attracts one strongly toward something (trahi ad alium), the task of reason consists in refraining that passion (reprimere, refrenare, temperare, repellere). Reason seeks to obtain that one does not follow this passion as it is; it seeks to introduce an element of reflection, distance, delay, and above all moderation of the excessive character of that passion. Thomas gives us here the examples of concupiscetia, spes, and ira. For example, when one loses himself in an uncontrolled need to consume enormous quantities of food and becomes "addicted" to the joy this provides him, then reason has the task of repelling this urge insofar as it lacks the proper relation to reason. Its tactics may include interrupting the immediacy of the urge by presenting the act of eating within a larger framework of human well being and a hierarchy of values related to that.

A second possibility that calls for the intervention of reason is the case in which one is pulled away from his normal activity by his passion (trahit ab eo). The role of reason then consists in encouraging the right passion (firmare). Thomas gives the example of fear (timor) that needs to be overcome by fortitude (fortitudo).

The Negative Influence of Reason on the Passions. In what precedes, I have discussed the positive role or "control" of reason over the passions. In this regard, the passions need reason in order to contribute to the human act. This aspect of the relationship between passions and reason is probably the best known and the most obvious to us. Thomas also recognizes, however, another aspect of this relationship: the negative or harmful influence of reason over the passions. This point has almost never been elaborated in the secondary literature.

Thomas points out that reason has a negative influence over the passions in an active and in a passive way. First of all, reason is capable of arousing the passions in an active and conscious way and can even command them (instigare, provocare, and imperare). Thomas is here thinking about the fact that human reason can provide the object that arouses the passions. (64) For example, we can think of someone who gets himself excited and angry by thinking about something. As pointed out above, this happens in the absence of a concrete object through the help of imagination.

In a more passive way, reason can have a negative influence insofar as it does not repress a sudden passion (reprimere, repellere, and coercere). What happens here is that reason does not make any effort to subsume the particular evaluation that accompanies the passion under its more universal considerations. For example, one can lose himself in feelings of lust and, although conscious of this, refrain from making the slightest effort to stop this indulgence. (65)

The issue of the negative influence of reason over the passions can be better explained if we look at

the distinction which Thomas makes between the so-called natural and nonnatural passions of the soul. (66) The difference between "natural" and "nonnatural" is based on the origin or cause of the passion. The cause of the passion is to be found as well in the object that arouses the passion as in the subject: the object arouses the passion, but every passion presupposes a patient, a subject that undergoes the passion. The question Thomas raises concerns the way in which the object and subject of the passions can be considered "natural." (67) According to Thomas, the natural object is that which contributes to the conservation of the self and the species on a primordial level. "Natural" here means vital: that is, food, drink, or the sexual object. When we speak about "natural" with respect to the subject of the passion, different options are present. "Natural" can refer to the generic nature of man, that is, insofar as he is a living being. It can, however, also refer to the specific nature of man, that is, his rational nature. Finally, it may refer to the individual nature. At this point only the generic nature of man is relevant to our discussion: we refer to the human being as subject of the passions insofar as he is a mere living being. On this vital level the conservation of his life, both on the individual level and on that of the species, is what matters. (68)

When we bring the objective and the subjective sides of the passions together, natural passions can be called "necessary" because they have an immediate link to the conservation of the subject on the most basic level of its existence. For that same reason they can be said to have a utilitarian character. Thomas says also that the natural passions presuppose an "absolute apprehension" of what the object is of my passion: he means here an immediate, nondeliberated grasp of what is appropriate on this level.

The above description of the natural passions is needed in order to understand what the nonnatural passions are. They differ from the natural passions with respect to their subject, object, and way of thinking involved. The subject of these nonnatural passions is not any more man as a being belonging to the genus of living beings. Rather, it is man as a rational being. Concerning the object of these passions, Thomas distinguishes three kinds of rational objects: (1) The specific rational objects such as the contemplation of truth (contemplatio veritatis) and the virtuous act. (69) (2) The objects of the natural passions. For example, the appetite for, and the enjoyment of, natural objects such as food, drink, and sexual objects, can become rational because these objects can become the objects of a rational, conscious striving. (70) But (3) the rational passion can also strive for nonnatural objects, objects that are considered to be beyond, praefer, the natural objects. (71) What Thomas has in mind here are the superfluous variations of the natural and necessary objects. They are objects that are no longer of vital importance for the individual human being's life or for the human species. Some examples would be: refined food, luxury banquets, selected wines, rich clothing, and also sexual perversion or pornography. It is noteworthy here that it is human beings themselves who invent these variants. Thomas uses such verbs as adinvenire or excogitare here. (72) The kind of knowledge involved here is not any more an "absolute" apprehension but "deliberative" knowledge.

Thomas does not particularly esteem the influence of deliberative reason in this last case. This becomes clear whenever he distinguishes between natural and nonnatural desire for, and pleasure in, objects of vital importance. Natural desire and pleasure are described as "limited," and the nonnatural as "unlimited." (73) The natural passions are limited in actu: it is the right kind of striving after and enjoying of objects of vital importance. A natural passion has a well-determined goal and reaches it in a certain, determined way. Thomas does not exclude, however, that these natural passions can be unlimited per successionem. There is a potential endlessness/finity in the absorption of an object. Let us take the example of food. One does not eat only once. Rather, characteristic of the intake of food is that it is an act that has to be done over and over again. (74)

Thomas defines the nonnatural passions—in contradistinction to the natural passions—as unlimited per
se. They have a relation to reason that carries in itself the power of the infinite. (75) This infinite is, however, a negative infinity. When a man, for example, loves money, he will try not only to become rich but to be as rich as possible. He loses the right hierarchy between means and ends. What ought to be a means becomes an end in itself, while the insight about the proper end is lost. Thus it is obvious that the distinction between natural and nonnatural passions presupposes a value-statement about the hierarchy of means and ends and has much to do with the distinction between heaven and earth, between the bodily and the spiritual.

The difference between the natural and the nonnatural passions shows us that Thomas recognizes the possibility of a negative influence of reason upon the passions. Man is capable of distorting his passions. "Distortion" here does not mean an internal change in the passions for reason cannot alter the passions in the sense that it cannot change the nature of the passions as a very specific kind of reaction toward the external world. Rather, "distortion" here means a "misuse" which arises in its turn from a wrong use of rationality. Instead of integrating the passions in man's striving for the fulfillment of his rational nature, he makes his wrong rationality a servant of the passions. He neglects his own rational nature.

The Negative Influence of the Passions on Reason. Thomas discusses far less and certainly far less directly the way in which reason can disturb the passions than he does the way in which the passions are apt to disturb rational activity. What is of importance here is that he distinguishes the degree of intensity of the influence of the passions from the way in which the passions disturb reason. Concerning the intensity of the passions, he distinguishes three levels of disturbance. (76)

In the first level of disturbance, reason can be absorbed by the passions in such a way that its normal use (usus) becomes impossible. In this case man loses his typically human insight. He degenerates by following the impetus of his passion. He functions without any kind of rational reflection and will. He loses himself in his passions instead of actively controlling his actions. Thomas gives the following examples. Excessive hatred or concupiscence can bring man "out of his mind" (amens) and turn him into a madman (furiousus). The same can happen in the case of anger, fear, and happiness. Clearly, in instances such as these, the moral quality of the act is diminished and the sinfulness of the act is mitigated because the individual is less rational, free, and responsible for his acts. There are, however, very few situations in which the passions completely annihilate the moral responsibility of man, as Thomas points out in his discussion of the causes of sin. He considers man in most cases responsible for his acts as well as for his passions.

The second level can be called no disturbance at all from the passions. In an ideal situation, the sensitive soul is wholly subject to reason. Within a biblical perspective, this was the case before original sin. This indicates that the tension between reason and passions is not primordial in man but is the result of the first sin that destroyed the harmony between body and soul. Only the virtuous individual approaches this ideal situation to the extent that he controls his sensitive appetites completely.

The third type of disturbance reflects our ordinary experience in daily life. Reason can be disturbed by the presence of the passions, but at the same time it is not completely absorbed by them. It can control and organize them without suppressing them. In this situation the passions can be an instigation to sin but never a sufficient cause. Note here that the passions at stake are antecedent passions in that they precede the rational act but do not follow it (compare below). This third type of disturbance can be understood better by connecting it to the way in which the passions disturb reason. Thomas distinguishes three ways in which this can take place: by contrariety (per contrarietatem), by distraction (per distractionem), and by binding (per ligationem). (77)
In the first case, where the passions disturb by contrariety (per contrarietatem), Thomas has in mind that the passions can appear in a sudden way and with an enormous power and strength, even before reason can pronounce its judgment or exercise its influence. Any consequent rational judgment is disturbed and even "clouded." The passions follow the sense-knowledge or imaginary knowledge and the sensitive judgment (vis cogitativa). The individual fails to perceive the particular object of the passion in the universal light of reason and the right principles of human action. His particular sensitive striving is not part of a larger rational striving. Contrarietas here means "against moral reason and its order." (78) It is clear that Thomas has in mind here contrariety to practical reason.

The antecedent passions disturb reason, however, also in another way: they disturb per distractionem. Because Thomas accepts that the powers of the soul are all rooted in one soul, he also accepts the principle of the balance of energy between the powers of the soul. Investing in the sensitive appetite happens on account of the act of the rational appetite. For example, when one invests all his energy in his passion, for example, fear, he then weakens the possibility of striving after something in a rational way. (79)

The negative influence of the passions can also be described in terms of the object that is striven after. Insofar as man is dominated by his passions, something might seem convenient to him which under normal circumstances would not be considered so. The will might follow this information and therefore strive after objects that, it would not seek under normal circumstances.

Finally, the passions disturb reason in a third way, namely, per ligationem. As mentioned above, a bodily or corporeal change accompanies every passion. Even though reason does not use and need the corporeal organs in its own activity, it presupposes the activity of the sensitive powers. These are disturbed, however, when the body is disturbed. When one experiences passions, his body is also involved. This bodily change in its turn can have a negative influence upon the activity of reason. Thomas gives the following example: the vehement effect of anger upon the heart and the external limbs prohibits the normal formation of a judgment of reason. Thomas also points to drunkenness, sleep, and conjugal sex as bodily activities that disturb the activity of reason and will in a fundamental, though temporary, way. (80)

The Positive Contribution of the Passions to the Rational Act. Passions disturb reason and its activity insofar as they precede rational activity. They can, however, have a positive and enriching role in human activity insofar as they follow reason and the rational appetite. A first possibility is that the intensity of man's will flows over into his sensitive appetite (per modum redundantiae). This passive movement is possible because of the internal connection between the powers of the soul. (81) We can think here about somebody who is intellectually involved in teaching but also develops a genuine emotion of liking his students. Another example of Thomas is that of justice: an act of justice can be followed by intellectual joy and by happiness on a sensitive level. One can feel genuine happiness when doing an act of justice. A second possibility is that man consciously and actively chooses (per modum electionis) to become affected by an appropriate passion (affici). In this case the passions follow the rational judgment closely and the result is an increased moral goodness. (82) Thomas gives the following examples. When an individual allows himself to feel a moderate fear, his fear does not disturb his rational activity and can contribute to a better moral act. It engenders a certain carefulness that causes that person to judge and act more attentively. Or, for instance, a moderate sadness can cause that, man to extend his knowledge in the hope of finding a way to rid himself of his melancholy. In other words, reflection on one's passions can make a person attentive to those moral aspects of a situation which he had never before taken into consideration. (83)

A third possibility is that the passions may influence reason by causing a certain "promptness" of
action because passions heighten one's motivation in acting. (84) For example, delight or joy causes a person to strive harder after something.

From these considerations we can see that the passions do not have to curtail or diminish moral goodness. On the contrary, passions may heighten the attention, engender motivation, urge one to act more quickly, and stimulate moral judgment and insight. This means that a rational act is richer when accompanied by feelings, by passions. A moral act that is merely a rational act, or a moral act based solely on emotions, is less rich and less balanced for man as a human being.

The purpose of this third part of my article has been to point out how the act of the sensitive appetite (or passion) forms an integral part of the human, rational striving for self-fulfillment. I have done so by considering the positive and negative aspects of their mutual relationship. I would like to stress here some central insights of this part. First, it is clear that the passions, as specific sensitive reactions to the external world, not only can but also need to become part of the overall human rationally guided striving for complete development as a person. Second, it is not the passions themselves, but reason which is to be blamed for an eventual absence of this participation of the passions in the human striving for the realization of one's telos. The passions cannot be blamed insofar as they are dependent upon some external cause (that is, the external world or the body). Reason, however, is to be blamed insofar as it does not function properly. This can mean that it misuses the passions in a rational but disordered way, or that it does not allow the passions as responses to the external world to become part and parcel of the overall striving to realize one's full human potentialities.

Man has to take responsibility, as a rational being, for his passions. Not to do so means ultimately to go against his natural movement toward fulfillment of his telos. This is fatal for man as a rational being in this world.

IV

Conclusion. The aim of this article has been to articulate an understanding of the passions of the soul within the larger framework of the anthropology of Thomas. I have stressed Thomas's hylomorphism, his insight into man as a "frontier" being, and his teleological understanding of man's nature. I wanted to show that the problem of the relationship between reason and the passions is not a problem of how to guarantee the rationality, freedom, and responsibility of man over and against the passions as movements of the irrational part in himself. Rather, given the basic fact that reason and passions have an original "political" relationship, reason has naturally and necessarily to relate to that which, though not essentially rational, is so by participation, to that which, though not automatically cooperator, is by nature capable of cooperating. This means that the passions can and should in principle become part of the human striving for fulfillment. We can here refer to what was said in section 1 of this article: a passion is capable not only of changing the natural disposition of a being but also of impeding its natural impetus or natural inclination. To avoid this is precisely the task of reason. It has to take up its responsibility toward the passions so that they can become part of this natural inclination. This does not imply that reason has to suppress the specific kind of reaction to the external world that is the passion, or that it has to deny the relationship of the passions to the body, or that it cannot recognize the specific goals of the passions. Taking up responsibility toward the passions as appetites of the sensitive level is to insert them into the overall striving of the human being toward his rational completion. Their particular goal has to become part of the broader, human-rational telos. The passions are to be negated only insofar as they do not take into consideration their original relationship to reason and also insofar as they are the result of a disordered rationality. They are, however, necessarily to be preserved by right reason on a higher level, with their own goals subsumed within the framework of the goals of reason.
To put it in a different way, the human act is a rational act. It is rational only to the extent that it allows its rationality to extend to everything that is rational and that participates in rationality. It follows, therefore, that the passions constitute one of the three principles of the human act along with reason and will.

A consequence of this is that the moral completion of man in this life includes that man gives a proper place to that in himself which relates to the body, to the external world, and, as such, to the unpredictable. Right moral behavior entails not the suppression of the passions but the development of the right attitude toward these sensitive appetites and to everything they stand for. It means making the passions of the soul an integral dimension of our ethical life. Only then will the harmony and balance between the two dimensions that characterize us as human beings be reached and will man show the impressive wealth of "being human." (85)
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(4) Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae 4 vols. (Turin: Marietti, 1948), I-II, q. 78, a. 1, c. The "c" in the references indicates the "corpus" or body of the article.

(5) We will not discuss the historical sources of Thomas's concept of the passions. We can refer to this context to the studies of Michael Wittman and Matthias Meier mentioned in note 1. For the medieval predecessors of this theory: Pierre Michaud-Quantin, La psychologie de l'activite chez Albert le Grand (Paris: Vrin, 1966).

(6) Thomas wrote also about the passions in earlier works. For example: his Scriptum super Sententiis Magistri Petri Lombardi (bks. 1-2: ed. P. F. Mandonnet, 2 vols. [Paris: Lethielleux, 1929]; bks. 3-4: ed. M. F. Moos, 2 vols. [Paris: Lethielleux, 1933, 1947]) (hereafter, "In I Sent.," "In H Sent.," and so forth). See especially bk. 3, dist. 15 and 26. De Veritate (Turin: Marietti, 1953 and various dates), q. 26, aa. 1-10. What needs to be stressed is that both works discuss the topic of the passions in the context of the passion of Christ. This is not explicitly present in the treatise on the passions in the Summa Theologiae.

(7) For the different meanings of pati and passio: In II Sent., d. 19, q. 1, a. 3, c; In I Sent., d. 17, q. 2, a. 1, ad 5; De Veritate, q. 26, a. 1, c and a. 3, c; In II De Anima, lect. 11, 365-6; Q. Quodlibetates 2, q. 7, a. 1, c; ST I, q. 97, a. 2, c; ST I-II, q. 22, a. 1, c and q. 41, a. 1, c. In ST I, q. 79, a. 2, c, Thomas writes: "pati tripliciter dicitur. Uno modo proprimum, scilicet quando aliquod removetur ab eo, quod convenit sibi secundum naturam, aut secundum proprium inclinationem... Secundo modo, minus propriae dicitur aliquis pati ex eo, quod aliquis ab ipso abjicitur, sive sit ei conveniens, sive non conveniens... Tertio modo, dicitur aliquis pati communiter, ex hoc solo quod id quod est in potentia ad aliquid, recipit illud ad quod erat in potentia, absque hoc quod aliquid abjicitur."

(8) ST I-II, q. 22, a. 1, c; ST I, q. 79, a. 2, c; ST I, q. 97, a. 2, c.

(9) ST I-II, q. 41, a. 1, c.

(10) For sensitive and intellectual cognition as pati: ST I-II, q. 22, a. 1, ad 1 and q. 41, a. 1, c; ST I, q. 79, a. 2, c and q. 97, a. 2, c; for the creation as a whole: see De Veritate, q. 26, a. 1 and a. 3, c.

(11) ST I-II, q. 22, a. 1, c; De Veritate, q. 26, a. 1, c; ST I, q. 79, a. 2, c.

(12) De Veritate, q. 26, a. 1 and a. 3, c; ST I, q. 79, a. 1, c.

(13) ST I, q. 79, a. 2, c; ST I-II, q. 22, a. 1, c.
(14) De Veritate, q. 26, a. 8, c.
(15) De Veritate, q. 26, a. 1, c.
(16) ST I-II, q. 22, a. 1, ad 1; De Veritate, q. 26, a. 1, c and a. 3, c.
(17) ST I-II, q. 31, a. 1, ad 3; ST I-II, q. 22, a. 1, c; ST I-II, q. 35, a. 1, c; ST I-II, q. 41, a. 1, c.
(18) Quaestiones quodlibetales, q. 2, a. 7, c; ST I, q. 79, a. 2, c.
(19) ST I, q. 79, a. 2, c; ST I, q. 97, a. 2, c; De Veritate, q. 26, a. 3, c; De Veritate, q. 26, a. 8, c.
(20) De Veritate, q. 26, a. 1, c; ST I, q. 79, a. 2, c; ST I-II, q. 37, a. 4, c.
(21) ST I-II, q. 37, a. 4, c; De Veritate, q. 26, a. 10, c; ST I-II, q. 48, a. 4, ad 3.
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